

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action dated October 28, 2008. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3-8 are pending in the Application. Claim 8 is added by this amendment.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1 and 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,754,764 to Davis ("Davis"). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 3-8 are allowable over Davis for at least the following reasons.

Davis shows an integrated circuit that includes network and input/output functions and a multicast address register (see, Davis, Col. 51, lines 22-42).

However, it is respectfully submitted that the integrated circuit of claim 1 is not anticipated or made obvious by the teachings of Davis. For example, Davis does not disclose or suggest, an integrated circuit that amongst other patentable elements, comprises (illustrative emphasis provided) "means for replicating a single request from the first electronic module into at least two replicated requests, and for sending the replicated requests to the second electronic modules, wherein said means for replicating comprises an address space and a facility for mapping at least one multicast address onto at least two further addresses

in a range of addresses, wherein the range of addresses comprises a first subset range of addresses and a second subset range of addresses, wherein each of the first and second subset ranges of addresses is greater than one address, wherein a first one of the second electronic modules is associated with the first subset range of addresses such that any request sent to any of the first subset range of address is sent to the first one of the second electronic modules and a second one of the second electronic modules is associated with the second subset range of addresses such that any request sent to any of the second subset range of address is sent to the second one of the second electronic modules" as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited by claim 7.

Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 7 are patentable over Davis and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Claims 3-6 and 8 depend from claim 1 and accordingly are allowable for at least this reason as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of the claims. Accordingly, separate consideration and allowance of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to

submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

Applicants have made a diligent and sincere effort to place this application in condition for immediate allowance and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Gregory L. Thorne/

Gregory L. Thorne, Reg. 39,398  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
December 29, 2008

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**  
Applied Technology Center  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101